

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
JASPER DIVISION

VONTAE BERNARD HENDRICKS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-G-1207-J
	)	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,	)	
Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

The plaintiff, Vontae Bernard Hendricks, brings this action seeking judicial review of a final adverse decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (the Commissioner) denying his application for Social Security Benefits. The plaintiff attained age 18 in 2007 and was eligible for supplemental security income benefits as a child for the month preceding the month in which he attained age 18. [R. 11]. The plaintiff was notified that he was found no longer disabled as of January 1, 2008, based on a redetermination of disability under the rules for adults who file new applications. Id. Thereafter, plaintiff timely pursued and exhausted the administrative remedies available before the Commissioner. Accordingly, this case is now ripe for judicial review pursuant to the provisions of section 205(g) of the Social Security Act


(the Act), 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

The sole function of this court is to determine whether the decision of the Commissioner is supported by substantial evidence and whether proper legal standards were applied. Bloodsworth v. Heckler, 703 F.2d 1233, 1239 (11th Cir. 1983). To that end this court “must scrutinize the record as a whole to determine if the decision reached is reasonable and supported by substantial evidence.” Bloodsworth, at 1239 (citations omitted). Substantial evidence is “such relevant evidence as a reasonable person would accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” Bloodsworth, at 1239. The court has carefully reviewed the entire record in this case and is of the opinion that the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence and that proper legal standards were applied in reaching that decision. Accordingly, the decision of the Commissioner must be affirmed.

Additionally, the court has considered the plaintiff's Motion to Remand and the defendant's response thereto, as is of the opinion that the motion is due to be denied.

A separate order in conformity with this memorandum opinion will be entered.

DONE and ORDERED 15 November 2011.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
J. FOY GUIN, JR.